

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-captioned application. Claims 1-14 are currently pending. By this amendment, claim 4 is amended. Support for the amended claim features may be found in the specification at least at page 7, lines 13-26.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 2-4, 6, 10, 11, 12 and 14 contain allowable subject matter.

The Office Action at page 2 objects to claim 4. The claim is amended to obviate the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 5, 7-9 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the Messing et al. publication (U.S. Published Patent Application US 2004/0061710). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Messing et al. publication does not teach or suggest, "a display apparatus in which a pixel expressing an input image is formed with delta-structured sub-pixels," as recited *inter alia* in independent claims 1, 5 and 8.

The application distinguishes a stripe topology as exemplified in Fig. 2 from a delta structure as exemplified in Fig. 1 (specification at page 1, lines 19 and 20). The specification clearly distinguishes methods and apparatus for rendering sub-pixel anti-aliased graphics (specification at page 2, lines 16-22), which method "can be applied only to stripe topology color displays" (page 2, lines 26-27). In contrast, the claimed invention encompasses methods and apparatus for rendering a color image on a display apparatus in which a pixel expressing an input image is formed with delta-structured sub-pixels, as recited in claims 1, 5 and 8.

The display sub-pixels as taught by the Messing et al. publication are of the stripe topology type (10, 12 and 14 of Fig. 1) resulting in a square shaped pixel 16 (paragraph [0003]). The stacked drawing of RGB sub-pixels (see 2) in Fig. 1 is merely a conceptual representation of a higher-resolution image 2 for mapping purpose (see paragraph [0004]), but is not indicative of a physical display structure.

Hence, the applied prior art does not in fact teach or suggest the positive recitations of the pending claims.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection and objection so that the present application can pass to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: March 4, 2005

By: 
Charles F. Wieland III
Registration No. 33,096

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620